UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,692	01/19/2002	Catherine Lin-Hendel	Lin-Hendel - Auto Scroll	3788

7590   08/25/2004

ZIMMERMAN & LEVI, L.L.P.
226 ST. PAUL STREET
WESTFIELD, NJ 07090

EXAMINER
MISTRY, O NEAL RAJAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2173	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	**Applicant(s)**
Office Action Summary	10/052,692	LIN-HENDEL, CATHERINE
	Examiner	**Art Unit**
	O'Neal R Mistry	2173

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _20 January 2001_.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) _1-39_ is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _20 January 2001_ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☒ All   b) ☐ Some *   c) ☐ None of:

        1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

        2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

        3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This application has been examined.

2.   Claims 1-39 are presented for examination.

Priority

3.   Claim priority to provisional application 60/262998 on January 20, 2001

Drawings

4.   The Examiner contends that the drawings submitted on January 20, 2001 are acceptable for the examination proceedings.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims1-24, 27-34,36-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Berstis et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,874,936).

6.   In regards to claim 1, Berstis discloses a method of automatically scrolling comprising the steps of:

placing a cursor on a respective end of a floating border structure (Figure 2 item 40 & 42);

and,

automatically scrolling through content extending beyond display window into a field of

view of the display window in a predetermined direction designated by the end (col. 2

lines 7-9) [This invention relates to a method and apparatus for

automatically scrolling the contents of a window using a remote

pointing device.].

7.   In regards to claim 2, Berstis states the floating border structure has a top end

and a bottom end (col. 2 line 66- col. 3 line 1 & Figure 2 item 32-36) [Referring now

to FIG. 2, there is shown the operation of the automatic scroll

function of the invention. A display area 31 contains multiple

open windows 32-36.]. The examiner interprets the meaning of a border in

www.onelook.com : **noun:** a strip forming the outer edge of something. After carefully

consideration the examiner deciphers that in Figure 2 items 32-36 have floating borders

structure on the top and bottom of the screen.; and

        the step (b) includes:

when the respective end is the top end, the content is automatically scrolled down to

bring the content within the field of view (col. 4 lines 56-63) [automatically

scrolling the contents of said active window beyond said one of

said associated boundaries in a direction indicated by said

cursor within said viewable area by said user;

        detecting the end of the contents beyond the associated

boundaries of said active window during a vertical scroll

operation;]; and,

when the respective end is the bottom end, the content is automatically scrolled up to

bring the content within the field of view (col. 4 lines 56-63) [automatically

scrolling the contents of said active window beyond said one of

said associated boundaries in a direction indicated by said

cursor within said viewable area by said user;

detecting the end of the contents beyond the associated

boundaries of said active window during a vertical scroll

operation;];.

8.   In regards to claim 3, Berstis discloses the floating border structure has a right-

side end and a left-side end (col. 2 line 66- col. 3 line 1 & Figure 2 item 32-36)

[Referring now to FIG. 2, there is shown the operation of the

automatic scroll function of the invention. A display area 31

contains multiple open windows 32-36.]. The examiner interprets the

meaning of a border in www.onelook.com : **noun:** a strip forming the outer edge of

something. After carefully consideration the examiner deciphers that in Figure 2 items

32-36 have floating borders structure on the left and right of the screen; and

wherein the step (b) further includes the steps of:

when the respective end is the right-side end, the content is automatically scrolled left

to bring the content within the field of view(col. 4 lines 33-39) [automatically

scrolling the contents of said active window beyond said one of

said associated boundaries in a direction indicated by said

cursor within said viewable area by said user;

detecting the end of the contents beyond the associated
boundaries of said active window during a horizontal scroll
operation]; and

when the respective end is the left-side end, the content is automatically scrolled right

to bring the content within the field of view (col. 4 lines 33-39) [automatically

scrolling the contents of said active window beyond said one of

said associated boundaries in a direction indicated by said

cursor within said viewable area by said user;

detecting the end of the contents beyond the associated

boundaries of said active window during a horizontal scroll

operation];.

9.   In regards to claim 4, Berstis states the steps of:

(c) moving the cursor away from the respective end (col. 4 lines 51-54) [detecting

movement of said cursor at one of said associated boundaries of

said active window responsive to the operation of said remotely

operable pointing device by said user]; and

(d) directly in response to the step (c), automatically stopping the step (b) (col. 4 lines

56-59) [automatically scrolling the contents of said active window

beyond said one of said associated boundaries in a direction

indicated by said cursor within said viewable area by said

user;] The examiner interprets that Berstis auto scroll as the ability of moving the

cursor away for the respective boundaries, and is directly connected to for

automatically stopping the step.

10.   In regards to claim 5, Berstis discloses the steps of:

(c) during the step (b), determining if a full-screen shift of the content has occurred (col.

3 lines 44-47) [If NO, the procedure causes a cursor to be displayed

and moves to block 68 to check if the cursor is at the screen

boundary.]; and

(d) in response to step (c) automatically pausing the step (b) (col. 3 lines 57-59) [If

YES, the procedure causes the cursor to jump to the closest open

window and processing continues at block 66. If NO, processing

continues at block 68.]. The examiner interprets in that when the cursor has

reached at the end of the boundary of the screen it is scrolling, then there is a

automatic pause until they user keeps on the scrolling and then reached the end of the

boundary of the following screen.

11.   In regards to claim 6, Berstis states further comprising the steps of:

(e) after the step (d), clicking a left key of a mouse (col. 3 lines 39-42) [If YES,

the procedure moves to block 64 where a determination is made

whether user input have been detected from the pointing device.

If NO, the procedure loops awaiting user input.]; and

(t) in response to the step (e), resuming the step (b) (Figure 3) In referencing

Figure 3, the examiner take into consideration the entire scrolling process, is resumed

any time when windows are opened or when the user initiate a automatic scroll function.

12.   In regards to claim 7, Berstis discloses the display window is a browser window,

and the content is a page (col. 2 lines 63-65) [Contents may include

representations of files, folders, documents, databases, and

spreadsheets, etc. Alternatively, the window 12 may also be said

to display information which may include text, video images,

graphic data, database records or spreadsheet cells.].

13.   In regards to claim 8, Berstis states the floating border structure is a floating line

or floating box (Figure 1 item 20 & Figure 2 items 40 and 42).

14.   In regards to claim 9, Berstis states the steps of:

activating a user control to perform one of: begin automatic scrolling, stop automatic

scrolling, advance scrolling a page, increase scrolling speed and decrease scrolling

speed (Figure 3 items 68-76).

15.   In regards to claim 10, Berstis states the steps of:

placing a cursor on at least one of a plurality of direction indicators (col. 1 lines 36-38)

[One prior art technique for insuring a known amount of

information will be displayed beyond the screen boundary is the

use of Page Down (PgDn) and Page Up (PgUp) keys.]; and

while the cursor is on the one direction indicator, automatically scrolling through

content extending beyond a display window, into a field of view of the display window, in

a predetermined direction designated by the one direction indicator. [One prior art

technique for insuring a known amount of information will be

displayed beyond the screen boundary is the use of Page Down

(PgDn) and Page Up (PgUp) keys.]. The examiner interprets that if a user is

allowed to use the arrows located on a scroll bar to automatically scroll through a

document, this is a predetermined direction designated by the direction indicator.

16.   In regards to claim 11, Berstis states a browser display window comprising:

        a display window having a field of view;

a first floating border structure having first and second ends oriented in a vertical plane

for effectuating automatic scrolling vertically through content within the field of view

when a cursor is placed on a respective one of the first and second ends (col. 4 lines

56-63) [automatically scrolling the contents of said active window

beyond said one of said associated boundaries in a direction

indicated by said cursor within said viewable area by said user;

detecting the end of the contents beyond the associated

boundaries of said active window during a vertical scroll

operation;]; and

a second floating border structure having third and fourth ends oriented in a horizontal

plane for effectuating automatic scrolling horizontally through content within the field of

view when the cursor is placed on a respective one of the third and fourth ends (col. 4

lines 33-39) [automatically scrolling the contents of said active

window beyond said one of said associated boundaries in a

direction indicated by said cursor within said viewable area by

said user; detecting the end of the contents beyond the

associated boundaries of said active window during a horizontal

scroll operation;].

17.   Claim 12 is substantially equivalent to claim 2, therefore claim 12 is rejected

because of similar rationale.

18.   Claim 13 is substantially equivalent to claim 3, therefore claim 13 is rejected

because of similar rationale.

19.   In regards to claim 14, Berstis states the content is a page (col. 2 line 63-65)

[Although the window 12 has been shown as displaying text, more

generally, the window may be said to display the "contents".

Contents may include representations of files, folders,

documents, databases, and spreadsheets, etc. Alternatively, the

window 12 may also be said to display information which may

include text, video images, graphic data, database records or

spreadsheet cells.].

20.   Claim 15 is substantially equivalent to claim 8, therefore claim 15 is rejected

because of similar rationale.

21.   Claim 16 is substantially equivalent to claim 8, therefore claim 16 is rejected

because of similar rationale.

22.   In regards to claim 17, Berstis states the automatic scrolling is limited to a full-

screen shift (col. 3 lines 44-47)[If YES, at block 66 a check is made

whether a cursor is displayed in an opened window in the viewing

area. If NO, the procedure causes a cursor to be displayed and

moves to block 68 to check if the cursor is at the screen

boundary.].

23.   In regards to claim 18, Berstis states the automatic scrolling is automatically

stopped when the cursor is moved away from the first floating border structure or the

second floating border structure (col. 2 lines 51-55) [In addition, the cursor 14

may be placed on the UP arrow 16 or Down (DN) arrow 18, and the

pointing device operated to move the contents vertically toward

the upper boundary 11 or lower boundary 23, respectively.]. The

examiner interprets that if scrolling

24.   In regards to claim 19, Berstis discloses the display window is a main display

window; and, further comprising:

        a second display window having a second field of view within the

main display window (Figure 2 item 34-36). The examiner interprets that in Figure 2

there are two different windows, and the main window is displayed on top;

        a first floating sub-border structure having first and second ends oriented

in a vertical plane for effectuating automatic scrolling vertically through content within

the second field of view when the cursor is placed on a respective one of the first and

second ends of the first floating sub-border structure (Figure 3 items: 68-76). The

examiner infers that Figure 3 is the method is which the user utilizes the automatic

scrolling function. Referring to Figure 3, it states a multiple functions of scroll speed,

check to see end of boundary on a window, and the ability to scroll to another page,

even if the mouse pointer is moving in all four directions; and

a second floating sub-border structure having third and fourth ends oriented in a horizontal plane for effectuating automatic scrolling horizontally through content within the second field of view when the cursor is placed on a respective one of the third and fourth ends of the second floating sub-border structure (Figure 3 items: 68-76). The examiner infers that Figure 3 is the method is which the user utilizes the automatic scrolling function. Referring to Figure 3, it states a multiple functions of scroll speed, check to see end of boundary on a window, and the ability to scroll to another page, even if the mouse pointer is moving in all four directions.

25.   In regards to claim 20, Berstis states:

a plurality of auto scrolling controls, the auto scrolling controls including at least two of :

a go button (Figure 3 item: 64);

a stop button (Figure 3 item: 64). The examiner interprets that if user does not use the pointing device, then ideally that is a stop botton, meaning there is will be no more activity with the point device;

a page button (Figure 3 tiem: 63 & 74);

a continuous button (Figure 3 item: 76) The examiner interprets that means when after reaching the boundary of the active, then having the ability to still on the next window.;

a slow down button (Figure 3 item: 72); and,

a speedup button (Figure 3 item: 69).

26.   In regards to claim 21, Berstis states the steps of:

displaying a page of a website (col. 2 lines 63-65) [Alternatively, the window

12 may also be said to display information which may include

text, video images, graphic data, database records or

spreadsheet cells.]; and,

automatically scrolling the page to push and allure navigation through the website (col.

2 lines 35-37) [This invention provides a method and apparatus for

automatically scrolling the contents of a window when a cursor

reaches any boundary of the window.].

27.   In regards to claim 22, Berstis discloses the website has multiple categories

wherein each category has multiple sub-categories; and further comprising the step of:

        displaying a floating dynamic instruction box overlaid on the page that displays

navigational links for alluring the user to further navigate to a category or to a sub-

category. The examiner notes that is well common in the art that, that pop-up

advertisement are floating dynamic boxes overlaid on the page that displays navigation

links for the user to search on the webpage.

28.   In regards to claim 23, Berstis states the page is a website home page (col. 2

lines 63-65) [Alternatively, the window 12 may also be said to

display information which may include text, video images,

graphic data, database records or spreadsheet cells.].

29.   In regards to claim 24, Berstis states the page includes at least one blinking

picture or link; and

        further comprising the step of:

dynamically changing the floating dynamic instruction box in response the

at least one blinking picture to entice the user to further navigate (col. 2 lines 63-

65) [Alternatively, the window 12 may also be said to display

information which may include text, video images, graphic

data, database records or spreadsheet cells.]. The examiner

interprets that if the window has the ability to display text, video images, graphic

data, and database, it also has the capability of a blinking picture to entice the

user for more navigation.

30.   In regards to claim 27, Berstis states the page includes at least two independent

windows (Figure 2 item: 32-34).

31.   In regards to claim 28, Berstis discloses the step of automatically scrolling

independently the at least two independent windows (col. 2 lines 16-20) [Once the

contents of the window have been scrolled to show the contents

extending beyond the boundary of the window, continued operation

of the remote pointing device causes the cursor to jump to the

next opened window in the viewable area.].

32.   In regards to claim 29, Berstis states:

automatically scrolling a first one of the at least two independent windows at a

first speed (col. 3 lines 57-59) [If YES, the procedure causes the cursor

to jump to the closest open window and processing continues at

block 66. If NO, processing continues at block 68.]. The examiner

interprets that when a jump is made to the next window, the method in Figure 3 item 66

start all over, and goes through the entire steps to determine boundaries or scroll

speed.; and,

automatically scrolling a second one of the at least two independent windows at

a second speed different from the first speed (col. 3 lines 57-59) [If YES, the

procedure causes the cursor to jump to the closest open window

and processing continues at block 66. If NO, processing

continues at block 68.]. The examiner interprets that when a jump is made to

the next window, the method in Figure 3 item 66 start all over, and goes through the

entire steps to determine boundaries or scroll speed.

33.   In regards to claim 30, Berstis states:

manually scrolling a first one of the at least two independent windows (col. 1 lines

36-38) [One prior art technique for insuring a known amount of

information will be displayed beyond the screen boundary is the

use of Page Down(PgDn) and Page Up (PgUp) keys.]; and,

continuously, automatically scrolling a second one of the at least two

independent windows (col. 2 lines 66-67) [Referring now to FIG. 2, there is

shown the operation of the automatic scrolling function of the

invention.].

34.   Claim 31 is substantially equivalent to claim 21, therefore claim 31 is rejected

because of similar rationale.

35.   Claim 32 is substantially equivalent to claim 22, therefore claim 32 is rejected

because of similar rationale.

36.   Claim 33 is substantially equivalent to claim 23, therefore claim 33 is rejected
because of similar rationale.

37.   Claim 34 is substantially equivalent to claim 24, therefore claim 34 is rejected
because of similar rationale.

38.   Claim 36 is substantially equivalent to claim 27, therefore claim 36 is rejected
because of similar rationale.

39.   Claim 37 is substantially equivalent to claim 28, therefore claim 37 is rejected
because of similar rationale.

40.   Claim 38 is substantially equivalent to claim 29, therefore claim 38 is rejected
because of similar rationale.

41.   Claim 39 is substantially equivalent to claim 30, therefore claim 39 is rejected
because of similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148

USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining

obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1.   Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2.   Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3.   Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.

       4.   Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

42.   Claims 25, 26, 35 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Berstis et al (U.S. Patent Number 5,874,936) in view of Bates et al (U.S. Patent Number 6,222,541)

43.   In regards to claim 25Berstis shows the ability to automatically scroll through documents that are display on a window. If the information excides the window size, the user has the ability to automatically scroll through the information using a pointing device that is connected to the information processing system, but Berstis does not discloses "automating sequences of blinking links in a page; and, activating the blinking links of the sequences to automatically and sequentially push navigation within the website."

Bates discloses a method for locating and selecting hypertext links, and redirecting the web user to the selected web page. The method is done by highlight links to make stand out compared to the HTML text. Highlighting the text means, adding different colors and underlining the text. Bates shows automating sequences of blinking links in a page; and, activating the blinking links of the sequences to automatically and sequentially push navigation within the website. (col. 9 lines 8-12) [If the right mouse button was pressed (step 560=YES), the web browser navigates to the corresponding web site (step 565). If the user did not press the right mouse button (step 560=NO), the link selection mechanism 126 returns to step 515.].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to combine Bates, highlighting and locating text method, with Berstis, automatic scroll apparatus, because in Berstis states the window may also be said to display information which may include text, video images, graphic data, database records or spreadsheet cells (col. 2 lines 63-65), and Bates states a web user simply navigates to a web page and scrolls through the web page using the slider on the scroll bar (col. 3 lines 9-12).

The modifications would have been obvious because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine because the number of web user, providers, and server continues to grow, and it will become increasingly for a web user to be able to quickly and efficiently located and select hypertext links embedded in we pages, while using the automatic scroll apparatus.

44.   In regards to claim 26, Bates states the sequences are based on user demographics or profile. (col. 9 lines 8-11) [If the right mouse button was pressed (step 560=YES), the web browser navigates to the corresponding web site (step 565).]. The examiner interprets that if the user decides to press the mouse button on a link, that the user is actually interested in the website. This would allow the website to push links based on user profile.

45.   Claim 35 is substantially equivalent to claim 25, therefore claim 35 is rejected because of similar rationale.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to O'Neal R Mistry whose telephone number is (703) 305-2738. The examiner can normally be reached on 9am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John W Cabeca can be reached on (703)308-3116. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

O'Neal Mistry
Assistant Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2173
o'neal.mistry@uspto.gov

RAYMOND J. BAYERL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2173